

Senator JOHNSON said cooperation from both parties is expected in getting approval of the legislation.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of February 29, 1956]

REALISTIC REFORM MEASURE

What the Democrat leader in the Senate is preparing to sponsor is described by him as a "complete realistic measure encouraging the fullest public participation and the fullest public review of all elections." It is intimated that the Republican Senate leader will be a cosponsor.

In view of the complexities of campaign financing and of public attitudes toward the parties and the individual candidates a complete realistic measure may not be actually attainable. But certainly some constructive changes are possible within the practical limits.

At present no nominee for the United States Senate can legally make personal expenditures totaling more than \$10,000. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Texas Democrat, is introducing a bill that would permit personal spending equivalent to 30 cents for each vote cast in the previous senatorial election.

The personal-expenditures classification would include not only what the senatorial nominee spent himself but also whatever spending he authorized others to do for him. A minimum ceiling of \$100,000 on such expenditures is projected in the Johnson bill.

Each nominee for a seat in the House of Representatives is currently under a \$2,500 restriction where personal campaign expenditures are concerned. If the Johnson bill were enacted in its present form each could spend \$25,000 or, if the 30 cents-a-vote formula were applied, even more in the most populous congressional districts.

Under this bill all campaign expenditures over \$100 would have to be reported to the Senate, the House, and to the United States district court in the nominee's home area.

Expenditures in primary campaigns are not covered by this bill. If legal limitations also were to be put on them the statutory ceilings projected in the measure would be unrealistic, at least in the States and districts where the popular voting is heaviest.

If this bill were enacted the present \$3 million limit on spending by each party's national committee would be scrapped. Each national committee could spend the equivalent of 30 cents per vote cast in the previous election. That would mean \$12,310,000 this year for each committee on the basis of the total national vote in 1952.

The Johnson bill projects Federal tax exemption on the first \$100 of each contribution for political campaigning. This presumably would not cause a sensational increase in the number of really big campaign contributions. It might, however, stimulate a remarkable increase in the number of smaller contributions.

Revision of the Federal elections laws to put them more in line with the increased costs of campaigning is long overdue. In principle and to some extent in detail the JOHNSON proposals, which may be approved by the Republican leader in the Senate, Senator KNOWLAND, have sensible reform import.

Enactment of this measure in its present form is not clearly indicated, but it looks as if some corrective action will be taken by Congress in the current session.

[From Broadcasting-Telecasting magazine of March 12, 1956]

STUCK WITH A SPLINTER

With a heavy majority of Senators already committed to support it, the Johnson bill to amend the laws governing political broadcasting and campaign spending seems set for prompt action.

It cannot be passed a moment too soon. It's too bad it wasn't passed early last week—before Lar Daly, who says he is run-

ning for the Republican presidential nomination as an America Firster, put the arm on all networks for equal time to answer President Eisenhower's February 29 appearance. The lunacies of the present political broadcasting law could not have been made more apparent.

In our view Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's bill is a good one, in the sense that it is probably the best broadcasters can hope to see enacted before the campaigns of 1956 begin in earnest and the splinter parties begin coming out of the woodwork in force.

The Johnson bill would modify the law to permit broadcasters to forget about giving equal time to unimportant candidates. It would increase the legal limits of campaign expenditures in recognition of contemporary costs of television time. These are desirable objectives.

But there have been behind-the-scenes maneuvers connected with the bill that are somewhat unsettling.

Some of the bill's supporters have unofficially let it be known that their support would intensify if networks volunteered substantial gifts of free time to political candidates. It would be very wrong if networks yielded to such pressure.

To deserve the support of broadcasters, any bill modifying the political broadcasting section 315 of the Communications Act must have as its purpose the freeing of restrictions on radio and television, not the freeing of time for canned oratory by politicians.

Broadcasters must be given more latitude in news coverage of political candidates and campaigns.

This news coverage may take many forms—straight news shows, panel discussions, interview programs like Meet the Press and Face the Nation. These are programs whose format and content are controlled by the broadcaster—not by the candidate or his party. They are journalism, not political rallies staged by partisan groups.

Under present regulations, radio and television are prevented from living up to the standards of good journalism in presenting politics. No responsible newspaper in the country would give a candidate with so little future as Lar Daly more than a few inches of type. Prospects at the time this was written were that if he proved to be qualified, radio and television would be obliged by an archaic law to give him a valuable block of prime time.

A good way for politicians to defeat their own attempts to obtain more exposure on radio and television is to continue to keep section 315 on the books in its present ungainly form.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1956—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. LANDERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 3308) to revise the Federal elections laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, to permit deduction for Federal income tax purposes of certain political contributions, and for other purposes, the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Senate will sit tomorrow until approximately 7 o'clock in the evening. We anticipate no rollcalls after that time. After the morning hour it will probably be 12 o'clock before we return to the consideration of the farm bill, but I hope we can expedite consideration of the bill and confine our remarks to the bill tomorrow and conclude our work on it.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 13, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art always graciously guarding and guiding us, may we daily commit ourselves resolutely and gladly to the wise and beneficent dispensations of Thy divine providence.

We penitently confess that we are frequently so easily daunted and frightened in the search and struggle to make our way through the darkness and uncertainties of this mortal life.

Grant that it may be the goal of all our aspirations to give ourselves unreservedly to the glorious task of doing Thy will.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 8, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2552. An act to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON, members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56-8.

DENTAL RESEARCH AND THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, the National Institute of Dental Research, established by Congress in 1948, is charged with the responsibility of stimulating and supporting through research grants an expansion of dental research activities in the Nation's dental schools and other private dental research centers. The institute is also charged with the responsibility of coordinating this program through a program of dental research conducted by its own staff of trained scientists. A continued lack of adequate support, however, has impeded the institute in its effort to achieve the objectives we have set for it.

The need for a sweeping inquiry into the causes and nature of dental disease is even more urgent today than it was in 1948 when we established the Dental Institute. Dental disease afflicts over 125 million of our citizens each year. The cost is staggering; our citizens spend over \$1½ billion a year for private dental care. The Nation loses over 45,000 man-days of labor each day as a result of dental ills. As we all know, dental disease is one of the chief causes of the rejection of our young men in the military draft. A disease of this magnitude and of these ramifications is worthy of our constant concern and helpful attention.

Unfortunately, however, dental research is inadequately supported. Since its establishment, we have given the Dental Institute only token appropriations in relation to the need for research into dental disease. Perhaps we do not realize that aside from the quarter million dollars that the American Dental Association spends, few private organizations contribute to dental research. In order to rectify this situation, I propose that this body take two actions designed to stimulate anew a needed expansion in dental research. These actions are: First, an increase of \$3,055,000 in the proposed budget for dental research grants; and, second, the enactment of legislation increasing the amount presently authorized for a dental research center to \$5 million.

The \$800,000 proposed in the budget for dental research grants does not take into account the pressing need for dental research or the capacity of the dental schools to conduct purposeful investigations into the causes of dental disease. The proposed appropriation will support a total of only 80 dental research projects. It will allow each of the 50 non-Federal research centers an average of \$16,000 a year for research purposes. This is in sharp contrast to the present capacity of these institutions in staff and facilities to undertake 390 planned projects next year. To utilize this available and trained manpower, an additional

\$3,055,000 is required. Unless we make these additional funds available many important investigations which promise to advance dental health significantly will be postponed indefinitely. A cure for pyorrhea and the discovery of a sugar which does not cause decay are not so far distant if we are willing to support a realistic program of dental research.

The second action I recommend is the enactment of a bill—H. R. 9688—which I have introduced to increase the amount presently authorized for a dental research center in Bethesda, Md., to \$5 million. This building and its facilities are desperately needed. At present, the Dental Institute occupies space assigned to it in several of the buildings of the other institutes. This space is not adequate for a coordinated and effective dental research program. We authorized this building in 1948, but owing to the Korean emergency it was not constructed. Now the amount originally authorized is insufficient to build the planned structure. Therefore, I have introduced H. R. 9688 to increase the authorization to cover the present cost of this research center and I ask every Member of this House to give this bill his full support.

DEVIATION FROM FUNDAMENTALS OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the life of a nation there come times when it behooves her people to pause and consider how far she may have drifted from her moorings, and in prayerful contemplation review the consequences that may ensue from a continued deviation from the course charted by the founders of that nation.

The framework of this Nation, designed in the inspired genius of our forefathers, was set forth in a Constitution, born of tyranny and oppression in a background of bitter strife and anguish and resting upon two fundamental principles:

First, that this was a Government of three separate and independent departments, legislative, executive, and judicial, each supreme in, but limited to, the functions ascribed to it.

Second, that the component parts should consist of independent sovereign States enjoying every attribute and power of autonomous sovereignty save only those specific powers enumerated in the Constitution and surrendered to the Central Government for the better government and security of all.

When repeated deviation from these fundamentals by one of the three departments threatens the liberties of the people and the destruction of the reserved powers of the respective States, in contravention of the principles of that Constitution which all officials of all the

three departments are sworn to uphold, it is meet, and the sacred obligation of those devoted to the preservation of the basic limitations on the power of the Central Government to apprise their associates of their alarm and the specific deviations that threaten to change our form of government, without the consent of the governed, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

Assumed power exercised in one field today become a precedent and an invitation to indulge in further assumption of powers in other fields tomorrow.

Therefore, when the temporary occupants of high office in the judicial branch deviate from the limitations imposed by the Constitution, some members of the legislative branch feel impelled to call the attention of their colleagues and the country to the dangers inherent in interpretations of the Constitution reversing long established and accepted law and based on expediency at the sacrifice of consistency.

The sentiments here expressed are solely my own, but there is being presented at this hour in the other body by Senator GEORGE on behalf of 19 Members of that body, and in this body by myself on behalf of 81 Members of this body, a joint declaration of constitutional principles, which, on behalf of the signatory Members of the House, I ask to be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Should other Members desire to associate themselves with the sentiments therein expressed, I will be happy to revise my remarks during the day to include their names on the list of House Members attached, if they will get in touch with me or Representative WILLIAM COLMER, who has headed the movement to see that the Members were given the opportunity to sign.

DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

The unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court in the public school cases is now bearing the fruit always produced when men substitute naked power for established law.

The Founding Fathers gave us a Constitution of checks and balances because they realized the inescapable lesson of history that no man or group of men can be safely entrusted with unlimited power. They framed this Constitution with its provisions for change by amendment in order to secure the fundamentals of government against the dangers of temporary popular passion or the personal predilections of public officeholders.

We regard the decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases as a clear abuse of judicial power. It climaxes a trend in the Federal judiciary undertaking to legislate, in derogation of the authority of Congress, and to encroach upon the reserved rights of the States and the people.

The original Constitution does not mention education. Neither does the 14th amendment nor any other amendment. The debates preceding the submission of the 14th amendment clearly show that there was no intent that it should affect the systems of education maintained by the States.

The very Congress which proposed the amendment subsequently provided for segregated schools in the District of Columbia.

When the amendment was adopted, in 1868, there were 37 States of the Union. Every one of the 26 States that had any substantial racial differences among its people either approved the operation of segregated schools already in existence or subsequently established such schools by action of the

same lawmaking body which considered the 14th amendment.

As admitted by the Supreme Court in the public school case (*Brown v. Board of Education*), the doctrine of separate but equal schools "apparently originated in *Roberts v. City of Boston* * * * (1849), upholding school segregation against attack as being violative of a State constitutional guarantee of equality." This constitutional doctrine began in the North—not in the South, and it was followed not only in Massachusetts, but in Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and other northern States until they, exercising their rights as States through the constitutional processes of local self-government, changed their school systems.

In the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, in 1896, the Supreme Court expressly declared that under the 14th amendment no person was denied any of his rights if the States provided separate but equal public facilities. This decision has been followed in many other cases. It is notable that the Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justice Taft, a former President of the United States, unanimously declared, in 1927, in *Lum v. Rice*, that the "separate but equal" principle is "within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools and does not conflict with the 14th amendment."

This interpretation, restated time and again, became a part of the life of the people of many of the States and confirmed their habits, customs, traditions, and way of life. It is founded on elemental humanity and commonsense, for parents should not be deprived by Government of the right to direct the lives and education of their own children.

Though there has been no constitutional amendment or act of Congress changing this established legal principle almost a century old, the Supreme Court of the United States, with no legal basis for such action, undertook to exercise their naked judicial power and substituted their personal political and social ideas for the established law of the land.

This unwarranted exercise of power by the Court, contrary to the Constitution, is creating chaos and confusion in the States principally affected. It is destroying the amicable relations between the white and Negro races that have been created through 90 years of patient effort by the good people of both races. It has planted hatred and suspicion where there has been heretofore friendship and understanding.

Without regard to the consent of the governed, outside agitators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes in our public-school systems. If done, this is certain to destroy the system of public education in some of the States.

With the gravest concern for the explosive and dangerous condition created by this decision and inflamed by outside meddlers:

We reaffirm our reliance on the Constitution as the fundamental law of the land.

We decry the Supreme Court's encroachments on rights reserved to the States and to the people, contrary to established law and to the Constitution.

We commend the motives of those States which have declared the intention to resist forced integration by any lawful means.

We appeal to the States and people who are not directly affected by these decisions to consider the constitutional principles involved against the time when they, too, on issues vital to them, may be the victims of judicial encroachment.

Even though we constitute a minority in the present Congress, we have full faith that a majority of the American people believe in the dual system of Government which has enabled us to achieve our greatness and

will in time demand that the reserved rights of the State and of the people be made secure against judicial usurpation.

We pledge ourselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision which is contrary to the Constitution and to prevent the use of force in its implementation.

In this trying period, as we all seek to right this wrong, we appeal to our people not to be provoked by the agitators and troublemakers invading our States and to scrupulously refrain from disorders and lawless acts.

Signed by:

Members of the United States Senate:
WALTER F. GEORGE; RICHARD B. RUSSELL; JOHN STENNIS; SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.; STROM THURMOND; HARRY F. BYRD; A. WILLIS ROBERTSON; JOHN L. MCCLELLAN; ALLEN J. ELLENDER; RUSSELL B. LONG; LISTER HILL; JAMES O. EASTLAND; W. KERR SCOTT; JOHN SPARKMAN; OLIN D. JOHNSON; PRICE DANIEL; J. W. FULBRIGHT; GEORGE A. SMATHERS; SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

Members of the United States House of Representatives:

Alabama: FRANK W. BOYKIN; GEORGE M. GRANT; GEORGE W. ANDREWS; KENNETH A. ROBERTS; ALBERT RAINS; ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr.; CARL ELLIOTT; ROBERT E. JONES; GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.

Arkansas: E. C. GATHINGS; WILBUR D. MILLS; JAMES W. TRIMBLE; OREN HARRIS; BROOKS HAYS; W. F. NORRELL.

Florida: CHARLES E. BENNETT; ROBERT L. F. SIKES; A. S. HERLONG, Jr.; PAUL G. ROGERS; JAMES A. HALEY; D. R. MATTHEWS; WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

Georgia: PRINCE H. PRESTON; JOHN L. PILCHER; E. L. FORRESTER; JOHN JAMES FLYNT, Jr.; JAMES C. DAVIS; CARL VINSON; HENDERSON LANHAM; IRIS F. BLITCH; PHIL M. LANDRUM; PAUL BROWN.

Louisiana: F. EDWARD HEBERT; HALE BOGGS; EDWIN E. WILLIS; OVERTON BROOKS; OTTO E. PASSMAN; JAMES H. MORRISON; T. ASHTON THOMPSON; GEORGE S. LONG.

Mississippi: THOMAS G. ABERNETHY; JAMIE L. WHITTEN; FRANK E. SMITH; JOHN BELL WILLIAMS; ARTHUR WINSTEAD; WILLIAM M. COLMER.

North Carolina: HERBERT C. BONNER; L. H. FOUNTAIN; GRAHAM A. BARDEN; CARL T. DURHAM; F. ERTTEL CARLYLE; HUGH Q. ALEXANDER; WOODROW W. JONES; GEORGE A. SHUFORD; CHARLES R. JONAS.

South Carolina: L. MENDEL RIVERS; JOHN J. RILEY; W. J. BRYAN DORN; ROBERT T. ASHMORE; JAMES P. RICHARDS; JOHN L. McMILLAN.

Tennessee: JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.; TOM MURRAY; JERE COOPER; CLIFFORD DAVIS; ROSS BASS; JOE L. EVINS.

Texas: WRIGHT PATMAN; JOHN DOWDY; WALTER ROGERS; O. C. FISHER; MARTIN DIES.

Virginia: EDWARD J. ROBESON, Jr.; PORTER HARDY, Jr.; J. VAUGHAN GARY; WATKINS M. ABBETT; WILLIAM M. TUCK; RICHARD H. POFF; BURR P. HARRISON; HOWARD W. SMITH; W. PAT JENNINGS; JOEL T. BROYHILL.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. RICHARDS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

NORTH AMERICAN AIRLINES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to address my colleagues on certain matters mentioned here on Thursday, March 1. At that time some remarks were made here which might well lead some of you to believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board is a tyrannical body which has been unjustly picking on a group of nonscheduled carriers which call themselves North American, and you might well believe from what was said here that it is all being done just to prevent the public from getting good air service.

I can't help doubting that some of those who spoke on this subject the other day have been fully informed about this matter.

In none of the remarks which were made is there any discussion of just what the North American group has been doing for 10 years. I would like to take just a few minutes to tell you.

The Civil Aeronautics Act was passed in 1938. It says you cannot conduct scheduled airline service until you receive a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the CAB. The Board grants certificates of that nature after full hearings in which the applicant has to prove that there is a public need for the route, and that he is fit, willing, and able to provide the needed service. That is the basis on which all the scheduled airlines with which all of us are familiar operate in this country and abroad. It applies to Eastern, to Capital, to National, to Piedmont, and to other local service airlines and to all the other scheduled operators.

North American has never received a certificate permitting scheduled operations. The only authority that it has now, or has ever had, from the CAB is to conduct nonscheduled operations. It is perfectly obvious that if a carrier with that kind of authority just goes ahead and operates a scheduled airline anyway, it is undercutting the principles upon which the whole Civil Aeronautics Act is based. That is exactly what North American has been doing and that is exactly why North American is in trouble with the Civil Aeronautics Board. There are more than 40 other nonscheduled carriers, and you never hear about them for the simple reason that practically every one of them is obeying the law, is flying on a nonscheduled basis, as it is supposed to do, and, therefore, is in no trouble with the CAB and has no ax to grind.

There are four men who regard themselves as the principals behind the North American group. In the late forties they owned and controlled three other nonscheduled carriers, every one of which was revoked by the Board for flying a scheduled service without authority. No sooner were those 3 revoked than these four men formed what they call the North American group and thereby continued to conduct scheduled operations. They have made no bones about this and have admitted on several occasions to

congressional committees that they fly a regular scheduled service. This frequently amounts to as many as 3 or 4 flights a day on a given route. This is what some of my colleagues chose to refer to as "technical violations." That is about the equivalent of saying that somebody who does not pay his income tax is technically violating the law. The Board has the following in its decision revoking North American:

Viewed in their proper perspective, these claims (which we do not concede as correct) demonstrate, from a different aspect, the respondents' disregard, indeed contempt, for the law—whether it be a statute of Congress, or regulations adopted pursuant thereto. Since respondents disagree with the policies heretofore adopted by the Board, and embodied in regulations and decisions of the Board, they apparently feel free to ignore the enactments of Congress and the regulations thereunder in order to vindicate their own conceptions of sound air transport policy. * * *

Even if we were to assume that the Board's policies have been unsound (and we make no such concession) it would be unthinkable to allow these respondents, or any other private parties, to take matters into their own hands, and have us condone such action. The plain fact is that Congress has enjoined anyone from engaging in air transportation without a certificate of public convenience and necessity or other appropriate operating authority from the Board. Respondents have flagrantly and willfully ignored the statutory plan. * * * After all, Congress has delegated to this Board, and not to respondents, the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

* * * If the respondents herein are permitted to ignore the Board's regulations with impunity, it will be difficult to expect that other air carriers will not follow suit, and the inevitable result will be a weakening of the whole regulatory structure which has taken years to build. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that the regulations of the Board extend not only to economic matters, but to safety as well. And while the current proceeding does not involve safety violations, it must be apparent that disregard of the Board's economic regulations cannot be condoned without running the risk that general respect for the Board's safety regulations also will be placed in jeopardy. In these circumstances, we feel compelled to take the firm action embodied in this decision. On this record, the Board finds that no sanction short of revocation would be sufficient to assure compliance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to make this statement for the simple reason that I come from a part of the United States where we have found it impossible to secure any air service other than from the National, Eastern, Southern, Piedmont and Delta Air Lines. I further understand that there is very little profit in airline service except in the long haul, nonstop, transportation. I certainly have nothing personal against North American Airlines except that it seems they are only interested in the long haul, nonstop flights, and we people in South Carolina are unable to benefit in any manner from this type of airline service. Hence, I could not sit by and hear the North American Airlines praised and not hear a word of praise for the small lines that stop in small towns in my State at very little profit, if any. My constituents greatly appreciate the

service rendered by the airlines that serve our State and especially Eastern Airlines, which serves my hometown, Florence, S. C. I think it is unfair to permit one or two airlines to make 50 percent of the long haul, nonstop flight profits and not be required to take some losses on the short-line service that serves the individual communities.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, emergency legislation is being help up by dilatory tactics. I refer to H. R. 8320, which provides critically needed funds for the operation of the school milk program for this fiscal year.

The House passed this bill unanimously on February 1. It was described correctly by you at that time, Mr. Speaker, as an emergency measure, and it was speedily acted upon by the Senate and passed that body with minor amendments and again unanimously on February 8. The bill should have been accepted at that time, but instead was sent to conference, and conferees were appointed on February 21, 3 long weeks ago, and nothing has been done. As of this moment, Mr. Speaker, the conferees have not met a single time. What is the reason for this delay? I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if tobacco were involved this bill would have been acted upon a long time ago.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand there is also a sugar bill that is receiving no consideration, although desperately needed by many farmers and others.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The will of the Congress in this instance is being thwarted. Legislation that has passed both Houses unanimously is being held up. The responsibility for this continuing delay rests solely on those in control of the conference. The situation, Mr. Speaker, demands your personal attention.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, using the gentleman's language, there has been nothing "shocking" about what has happened. The facts are that the bill to which he refers went to the other body and the amendments which they inserted were not minor, as he stated. The amendments were highly important and of a permanent character. The legislation which passed the House

was purely of an emergency character. It is not for me to criticize the other body on what was done, but it did tack on amendments far beyond an emergency character.

Now as to the conference, the facts are that the conferees were appointed. It is not for me to criticize the other body as to why a conference has not taken place, but it is known to all Members of the House that the other body has been constantly engaged in debate on a very important bill relating to agriculture. The conferees have necessarily been engaged in that debate.

Also, it is well known or should be known and could have been determined, if the gentleman from Wisconsin had inquired, that a conference was set and, unfortunately, for reasons I would be happy to explain to the gentleman and all Members of the House, but for the sake of time I will not go into detail here, the conference had to be canceled. A conference was set for a second time and it also had to be canceled for reasons which were suitable to the Members of the other body.

There is nothing "shocking" about this as the gentleman suggests. There is no effort on the part of anyone, as the gentleman from Wisconsin and the minority leader indicate, to bury or scuttle the legislation. The bill happened to be my bill. I was for it. My State would not get one 10 cents' worth of benefit from it. We have sufficient funds for our program; but the gentleman from Wisconsin and his State would get benefits from the bill. Still, I am for the bill. I want to help them out and will do so if he will just cooperate and convey his messages and complaints to me instead of conveying them by surprise speeches on the floor of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman knows there was a conference called for by March 2.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes; I know that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The Senate asked for a conference on Saturday the 3d and Monday the 5th, and they were turned down.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And they cancelled the conference on Saturday the 3d. None was set for the 5th. If so, I never heard of it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There has never been a request for a conference.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I regret that the gentleman made that statement. He knows nothing about what I have done to have a conference. I personally have requested such and have done my best to get the conferees together.

The chairman and other members of the House Committee on Agriculture were engaged on March 2 in hearing witnesses from the National Grange and the National Farmers Union and possibly the Farm Bureau on the then very important matter before the Committee on Agriculture, the overall bill on agriculture. They did not feel they could walk out

on the presidents of these farm organizations. We endeavored to reschedule the conference for Saturday, March 3.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman knows there is no bill before the Committee on Agriculture and there has not been on this. We have just been getting an overall picture of the problems of agriculture. There is no bill before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has a bill there, does he not?

Mr. HILL. I certainly have, but there is no bill before our committee.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But you did think the subject matter was important enough to be present? You were there.

Mr. HILL. But I am telling you that you do not have any bill before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thought you had your own bill there. Do we not have an overall agriculture bill pending before the committee? Also the President's farm recommendations upon which he was pleading for hasty action.

Mr. HILL. You have never had as much as one meeting on my bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Have you asked for one?

Mr. HILL. These dilatory tactics certainly should be stopped.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You were sitting there. I thought we were hearing testimony on the gentleman's bill, the President's recommendation, and other pending farm proposals. I did not know the gentleman had no bill.

Mr. HILL. There is no bill before the Committee on Agriculture. That is what I am trying to get you to admit.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman explain the delay on the sugar bill?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not have a thing in the world to do with the sugar bill except as an average member of the committee. I certainly want to say that tobacco is not involved, as has been intimated. The tobacco people do not get any benefit from either the school milk or sugar bills as has been intimated—I am very sorry that the gentleman from Wisconsin inserted that matter into this discussion. I am trying to be helpful to the Wisconsin dairy farmers, as well as all other farmers.

Mr. MARTIN. How about trying to give the sugar people a little help? They seem to need some help too.

Mr. ABERNETHY. We might do so if we can get the Republicans to cooperate. I believe that is about what the gentleman told the gas people down at Houston after the President's veto—that you Republicans would still get the gas bill by if you could get the Democrats to cooperate.

Mr. MARTIN. If the gentleman will yield a little further on this unexpired time, may I say that the Republicans will cooperate on all farm legislation with the Democrats at any time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman is very kind and we are delighted to hear of your change of heart.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I do not believe they cooperated with us on the

90 percent of parity bill in the Senate the other day?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; they have their own views on it.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] said no bill was before our committee. That may be true, but the Secretary of Agriculture has a program. I do not know whether it deserves the dignity of being referred to as a bill or not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think everybody knows that both committees of the Senate and House on agriculture have been terribly busy for the past several weeks. It may be that no particular bill is pending, although personally I think the gentleman from Colorado is mistaken about that. Certainly the overall subject matter and the President's program are pending: If we have really been working on nothing all this time, it seems quite silly and ridiculous that the gentleman from Colorado has been so regular in attendance and such an attentive listener.

HOUSING FOR ELDERLY CITIZENS

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill—sponsored by myself, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, Mr. ADONIZIO of New Jersey, Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ASHLEY of Ohio—to provide decent housing at a low cost for our elderly citizens.

I have been concerned with this problem for a long time. I have been deeply disturbed by the statistics which show the low income status of many elderly persons and families, and by the pitiful housing conditions which many of these people face. I think the time for governmental help on this problem is long overdue, and I believe that this bill will offer a very real benefit to our elderly citizens.

The bill would set up in the Housing and Home Finance Agency a new program to provide low-cost financing on liberal terms to nonprofit corporations interested in building decent housing for the elderly. The program called for in the bill is substantially similar to the college housing loan program, which has been so successful in providing needed financing to our colleges and universities for housing and related facilities for students and faculty members.

Under this bill financing would be made available at an interest rate not to exceed 3½ percent per annum and for a 50-year term. The availability of financing on such liberal terms should go far toward attracting charitable, civic, fraternal, and other public-spirited groups, to build the housing so greatly needed by many of our elderly citizens.

One of the special features of the bill is the hope that in many cases the sponsoring nonprofit group will be willing to charge less than economic rents to their elderly tenants. By subsidizing the dif-

ference between the rents to be charged and the economic rent, the sponsoring organization could offer dwelling units to elderly citizens at rent levels more in keeping with their ability to pay.

Recognizing that the payment of such a subsidy would naturally place an economic burden on the funds of the sponsoring nonprofit organization, I think it is vital that financing be made available to such groups at the least possible cost and most liberal terms. In this way any rent subsidy which they may pay could be kept to a minimum.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, I want to state as emphatically as I can, that this bill is in no way to supplant or compete with low-rent public housing for the elderly. I am entirely in sympathy with proposals to include elderly single persons in the low-rent public housing program.

This bill would provide another vehicle—supplementing the public-housing proposals—to make available decent low-cost housing to additional groups of elderly citizens.

The administration housing bill proposes a program which on the surface has a resemblance to the program proposed in this bill. The administration proposal would set up a program within the FHA for insured mortgage loans to provide financing for nonprofit corporations to build housing for the elderly. I do not know precisely what financing terms this would involve, but it is clear that in order to get participation from mortgage lenders, the administration proposal would have to call for an interest rate of at least 4¼ percent, and when you add the one-half of 1 percent insurance premium which the corporation would have to pay to the FHA, you get a gross financing cost of 4¾ percent. Moreover, the maximum permissible loan term would probably be limited to 40 years which is the maximum term which FHA permits for all its multifamily housing operations.

In contrast this bill would provide 50-year loans at a gross financing cost of 3½ percent. Such a loan would require a debt service payment of \$4.17 a month per thousand dollars of mortgage, whereas the administration proposal would require a debt service of \$5.61 a month per thousand.

Now let us see what the tangible significance of the difference of these cost factors is. It is hoped that the per unit cost of the typical type of housing which would be built for elderly citizens under my bill would be in the neighborhood of \$7,000. In this connection, I am informed that apartments of good quality have been built for married students and their families under the college housing program at a cost of approximately \$7,000 per unit. The probable economic rent for such a unit, if you use the FHA program such as the administration proposes, would be around \$60 per month. Under this bill the economic rent for the same unit would be approximately \$10 less per month, thereby reducing the probable rent from \$60 to \$50 per month.

Bear in mind I am now speaking of the economic rent. The actual rent charged to elderly tenants could be reduced further to the extent of the sub-

sity which the sponsoring institution would be willing to absorb.

There is no question in my mind that the enactment of the program called for in this bill would provide an effective and workable means of building the type of housing which our elderly citizens so vitally need. The combination of the efforts and resources of public spirited groups and the providing of financing by Government auspices on low-cost, liberal terms, should provide an effective formula for coming to grips with this most pressing problem.

This bill proposes an initial fund of \$250 million to get this program started. Assuming a \$7,000 per unit cost, that sum would permit the construction of approximately 35,000 dwelling units for elderly citizens.

The interest rate proposed in my bill is 3½ percent per annum. Because the social objectives of providing much needed housing for elderly citizens is so laudable, there is a natural temptation to extend the most liberal possible Federal aid without regard for other considerations. But in order to induce at least some participation on the part of private lenders, the realities of the money market must be taken into account. The present 2¾-percent rate prescribed under the college housing loan program is apparently producing no private lender participation. It is my hope that the 3½-percent rate proposed for housing for the elderly projects will enable some participation on the part of private investors at least for bonds of a shorter maturity of the serial bonds which would be issued to finance the project.

I would like to point out that the general outlines of my proposal were approved in a recent report of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee, a subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman. The specifics of the proposal, however, are mine.

I deeply hope that this bill will enlist the support of all those interested in relieving the housing problems of our elderly citizens, and that the bill will receive prompt and sympathetic consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee.

HENRY C. LUCKEY, A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the book 85 American Years by Henry C. Luckey, a former Member of this House, was compiled and written when Mr. Luckey was 85 years old. It is a fascinating story of the life of a pioneer family and a boy born on a farm in the Midwest. The book summarizes the struggles that Henry Luckey himself underwent to climb from a struggling farm boy to

become a Member of Congress from Nebraska.

Not only is the book a fascinating story of Mr. Luckey's life, but it contains much of his economic, social, and political philosophy gained through experience and keen observation. The book in expressing Mr. Luckey's philosophy is a logical indictment and a sincere criticism of the so-called New Deal, and the international policies of the Roosevelt administration.

Mr. Speaker, 85 American Years was written by a great American, one of the best informed men in public life I have ever had the privilege of being associated with, a man who was too big to be confined within party lines, a man who placed America first and party second in all his thinking and in all the votes he cast in this House.

I recommend the book 85 American Years as both interesting and informative, a book that every Member of Congress should read.

THE SECOND ROUND IN THE SENATE ON 90 PERCENT OF PARITY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the second round on 90-percent parity—covering milling wheat—came out a tie vote 45 for and 45 against. This gave Vice President Nixon a chance to get in on the proceedings and he voted against parity so the second round was carried by the Eisenhower administration, with the help of Democrats.

I think this was pretty sour medicine for Nixon, as he was personally for parity, but he is also a candidate for Vice President again, and of course did not think much of bucking the President. I could have told you how he would vote before he voted. This vote may endear him to the delegates at the national convention, and it may not. His vote will at least keep his candidacy alive for awhile, but in the end he will probably be overlooked. I presume it is a great honor to be Vice President—guess there is no doubt about it, but I would have had a different notion if I had been Vice President. I would not desert the small family type farmers for any office. I would have voted to keep parity in the bill if that was my judgment and let Eisenhower and Benson howl. They could not do any more than sidetrack Nixon and that may be done anyway. It takes plenty of nerve to stick with your convictions, and brother Nixon does not have it when the chips are down.

There seems to be much rejoicing in some of the newspapers and conversations in Washington over the defeat of parity. All believe now that the price of bread will go down and "those rich farmers" will have to go out and work for a living. Well, when bread goes down I hope some bread eater will give me due

notice. Those who hold this belief had better celebrate now, for when the depression gets going in the farm belt, it will put a lot of people in this now prosperous East in the soup line. This happened 26 years ago and the way legislation is going here in Congress, it is altogether likely that will happen again. Benson showed he is a politician par excellence. When it looked as though parity would be sustained all along the line, he lined up the Democrats—from the Cotton Belt—and promised them 87 percent of parity and that did the business.

When brother Benson gets out in the Wheat Belt and the farmers find out that Benson soil-bank acres will be taken out of the already meager allotted acres for wheat, there will be a roar go up that will probably last until election day. But the trouble is Benson is not running for reelection and anyway the farmers should not fasten all the blame on him, for, after all, Benson is simply the servant of President Eisenhower and he is not a servant of the people who vote. The voters did not put Mr. Benson in the office he holds; he was put there by the President's appointment, and for the purpose for which he was appointed, he has no doubt served the President well. Some day it may come to pass that a Secretary of Agriculture can be found who will serve the people. If such a Secretary can be found, he will not serve long if he does not please the President.

In all our history we have had only one Secretary who would not follow the President and that was William Jennings Bryan. He said, "No, I will not be a party to putting this country in a world war." President Wilson said in substance, "you will bend your will to mine or get out." Bryan got out and we got into the war. Each day we are becoming more mired down in foreign entanglements.

Of course this fight has not yet been lost. When the bill comes back to a conference between both Houses I am sure the House Members will stick to 90 percent of parity, especially on milling wheat. The surplus argument cannot be made on hard spring wheat, for the reason there is no surplus, if the same kind of wheat were not imported from Canada.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a declaration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, March 8 was the Communists' International Women's Day. We can expect a great flood of propaganda to be released throughout the world to win over women to the Communist conspiracy.

The Women for Freedom of Europe, a private organization affiliated with the General Federation of Women's Clubs, has issued a declaration designed to

counteract this strong Communist appeal. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting this declaration:

WOMEN FOR FREEDOM OF EUROPE, INC.,
New York City.

DECLARATION ON INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S
DAY, MARCH 8

Today the Communist regimes use all the channels of communication to speak to women. They are extolling the importance of women to the Communist state, the rights and privileges and happiness they enjoy in the people's democracies.

The women behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are addressed as the "carriers of peace" who are helping the Communist regimes in their drive for the brotherhood of man and for peace in the world.

While the Communist leaders and speakers call upon the spirit of the Geneva Conference to extoll their achievements for peaceful coexistence, the women of the free world must speak out for all women to hear.

We, too, pray and work for peace, but not for the Communist concept of peace. Their peace means only the absence of war. Their "peaceful coexistence" means the continuance of diplomatic, economic, and cultural relations, while stealthy subversion works for the final Communist victory: Subjugation of nations and individuals.

Our concept of peace is indivisible from freedom. We cannot conceive of peaceful coexistence with governments unless they serve their people instead of oppressing and exploiting them. We cannot conceive of peace and the brotherhood of man unless the bodies and the minds of individual citizens are free.

Living in peace means to us daily practice of individual rights. We worship God with our men and children in our own way at a place of worship of our own choice. We read any book, magazine, or paper we choose and discuss freely highly divergent opinions they present. Our right to assemble makes it easy to meet for any purpose we feel we should talk over. We enjoy our right to move about freely at home and abroad. It gives our husbands great opportunities in their work and their earning power. It gives us great choice to establish our homes in the part of the country we like best and to visit any other part of the world we wish to see. We treasure these personal rights which allow us to establish our unique identity, the prerequisite of every human being. We can be what God made us, without hindrance.

Our social security and happiness are founded on justice and served by the protective rights of each individual. We have the right to petition for the relief of grievances without the fear of retaliation by the men in power, which is evident in all Communist states.

The right of habeas corpus without excessive bail protects all citizen from being held without trial for months and years in dungeons and slave camps such as the ill-famed Vorkuta, Mislea, Jachymov, Csolnoky Szabanya, and Belene. We are held innocent until proved guilty in trial by jury, without advance confessions obtained by torture and brainwashing.

Our families enjoy fully the rights to ownership. Our homes, fields, businesses and all the other possessions that help make our life comfortable and secure are our very own. We help our men in earning them and caring for them, and share with them the feeling of joy and security they give us and our children. We give hospitality to our friends in the complete privacy of our homes; we manage our property and make contracts about our affairs without Government interference.

Perhaps the privilege we enjoy most for ourselves and our children is the full freedom to express our individuality through

creative work and to translate our work into enterprise. We are free to select and to go into business, compete and make profit. No nationalization threatens us if our business should grow. We share in the abundance of national goods and services by our right to bargain for them in a free market, providing food and clothing and other family needs of highest standard for the least expense.

As workers we have the right to bargain with our employers and to call upon the Government to protect this right, without plaguing us by norms which have to be surpassed if we and our families are to live. Our men come home with their pay, their health, pension, and vacation benefits, and even with the profit-sharing stocks in their company to help us get the enjoyment we have been planning for together. Thus we are partners with millions of shareowners in Wall Street and have no fear of its sinister influence on our people's capitalism.

But living together in harmony, permitting the creative spirit to seek its own destiny, we serve our fellow men in freedom. This is our way of living in peace.

It is this indivisible unity of peace and freedom which can help sustain the spirit of women behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, and which the women of the free world uphold.

PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the membership on tomorrow on H. R. 9166, the Tax Extension Act of 1956, a rollcall vote will be requested.

I also desire to advise the membership that on Thursday next, House Resolution 376, providing for Investigations Committee on Veterans' Affairs, has been programed.

WITHDRAWAL OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 I inserted an extension of remarks in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it may be withdrawn from the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LIBERALIZATION OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I note with a great deal of satisfaction that the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee has appointed a subcommittee to study the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

I am the author of H. R. 7237, calling for the liberalization of this act, which

is substantially the same as the bill S. 2280, which was passed by the Senate last July, and it is my hope that the subcommittee will act on this legislation as speedily as possible.

Improvements in the benefit features of the act are long overdue. When the act was first passed in 1927 it provided the average disabled longshoreman with benefits equal to two-thirds of his weekly earnings. Today, under the act, the average longshoreman can only obtain little more than one-third of his weekly wages.

With the exception of a moderate revision of benefits in 1948 and technical amendments in preceding years, the act remains as written in 1927. This not only accounts for the failure of the act to carry out its original intent; it also points up the need for action by this Congress.

The Longshoremen's Act covers workers who are engaged in employments within the exclusive Federal admiralty and maritime jurisdiction in the United States, in Hawaii, and in Alaska. The principal categories of workers are as follows: Longshoremen or stevedores, ship repairmen, ship servicemen, harbor workers, and other workers on the navigable waters of the United States, but excluding seamen.

The Longshoremen's Act is also the basic workmen's compensation law for employees privately employed in the District of Columbia, it having been extended to those employees by the act of May 17, 1928, as amended—title 36, District of Columbia Code, page 501; and it is the basic law covering employees of contractors with the United States engaged in manifold employments outside continental United States, it having been extended to them by the Defense Base Act of August 16, 1941—title 42, United States Code, page 1651. Whatever changes are made in the Longshoremen's Act will, without further legislative action, bring about equivalent changes in the two laws mentioned.

The benefits payable under these laws are provided by private insurance or self-insurance arranged by private employers in the same manner as in any typical State workmen's compensation law. The Government does not pay the benefits under the Longshoremen's Act.

The basic purpose of the act is to provide most covered workers with substantially two-thirds of their wages when totally incapacitated by industrial accident. Unless the maximum and minimum compensation rate levels are adjusted by legislative action as circumstances require, the security of the workers becomes impaired and the workmen's compensation law loses its effectiveness. This is not only an inequitable result, but the situation tends to lead to industrial disputes by triggering demands for non-statutory supplementary benefits from employers to make up the deficit. The redressing of benefit levels is accordingly a necessary function of government designed to carry out the basic purposes of the act.

Liberalization of the indemnity schedule world bring the present act more in line with modern concepts of workmen's compensation. On this subject I agree,

and I believe the majority of the Members will agree, with the Secretary of Labor when he recently stated:

We should attempt not only to compensate the injured worker, but to restore him to his former producing capacity. We no longer think of workmen's compensation as a private contest between employer and employee but as a type of income insurance. No longer do we think of workmen's compensation as a cash payoff but instead as a means of restoring not only the worker's wages but the worker himself.

It is my hope that the House will have an opportunity to approve such legislation in the course of the present session.

ADEQUATE HEALTH INSURANCE FOR OLDER CITIZENS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the introduction of a bill which is aimed at helping the great need of our older citizens for adequate health insurance. Our older people are more prone to illness, a weakness which increases for them with each passing day. This problem is most acute to those over 65. Today there is no adequate low-priced hospitalization available to our senior citizens. Indeed, only 1 in 3 of the people over 65 has health insurance of any sort. The national average, however, is that 2 in every 3 persons has such coverage.

Now we know that almost to a man our people over 65 have small incomes, usually limited to only social-security benefits on which the average retired worker gets about \$62 a month. A retired worker and his wife get about \$100 per month. Only 1 couple in 4 over 65 has an income of more than \$50 per month over and above their social-security benefits and fewer have even small savings. To people like this, sickness and its attendant expense are disastrous. Private health-insurance plans offer relatively little to the older citizens of this country. Adequate coverage for persons over 60 is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. Private health-insurance plans usually refuse to issue such coverage. It is also difficult for such persons to retain coverage which they already had. Many insurance companies find compelling reasons to purge their lists of insured to remove the more costly risks, outstanding among whom are our older people.

Where coverage is offered to such older citizens, it is at such a high price as to be outside the reach of those who most need it, or undesirable by reason of the extremely limited nature offered to the advanced-age brackets.

The cure for this need is simple, and is not the old discredited reinsurance program proposed by the administration for the benefit of the insurance companies.

My bill extends the social-security system to offer to everyone over 65 receiving social-security benefits 60 days of hospitalization in a semiprivate room, the cost of which would be paid from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. The dependents of insured aged persons and the survivors of deceased insured persons would also be covered by my bill. No doctor bills will be paid under this proposal except as incident to hospitalization. The cost today for such a proposal would be a maximum of \$300 million a year. Over the long-range, the average cost would rise to \$500 million.

My bill offers this with no advance in premium rates already scheduled, and without impairing the financial integrity of the fund, because under the schedule of taxation of existing law income grows faster than payments from the fund in periods of rising income, as we have had since the founding of the system. The primary monthly cash benefit is 55 percent of the first \$100 of average income plus 20 percent of the next \$240. As earnings rise a larger part of wages results in benefits at the 20-percent rate than at the 55-percent rate.

In the same bill I propose to increase the income of the fund by another feature, by raising the interest rate from about 2.3 percent to a full 3 percent, as is paid on other retirement funds, administered by the Federal Government, such as the railroad-retirement account and the civil-service retirement fund. Since the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund is presently about \$22 billion, a 0.7 percent increase will mean up to \$154 million per year in additional income, which in good conscience should be paid to the fund.

I want to make it clear that there is no necessary connection between the increase in the existing benefits by offering hospitalization to those covered by the law and the raising of the interest rate. As a matter of fact the raising of the interest rate was requested by the trustees and included in the President's budget message.

This bill will benefit all who are recipients of social-security benefits, and in addition it will benefit hospitals and charitable agencies by reducing their cost burden for handling such cases. Both of the features of the bill have already been requested by the administration.

The wise humanitarian features of this bill are such as to commend themselves to all but the most callous. I am sure they will commend themselves to the great Ways and Means Committee and to the membership of this Congress.

RESOURCES OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 15 there will convene at Ciudad

Trujillo in the Dominican Republic an important hemispheric Conference on Conservation of Natural Resources, the Continental Shelf, and Oceanic Waters. Representatives of all the 21 American Republics are expected to attend this Conference, which, among other matters, will discuss the problem of the limits of territorial waters, high seas fisheries conservation, and economic as well as scientific problems related to the exploitation of the resources of the Continental Shelf.

Of particular interest to the United States will be the discussion of the legal limits of territorial waters. As many of us know, a rather hasty and, in the opinion of our Government, ill-considered resolution on this subject was approved at Mexico City last month by a number of Latin American countries. The resolution to which I refer was brought up at a meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists, which had met for the purpose of making preparatory studies for the Ciudad Trujillo Conference. It went far beyond its province in attempting to give the character of a declaration to this resolution, which asserted the sovereignty of nations to large bodies of the ocean off their coast. Indeed, some of its proponents laid claim to waters off their coasts up to a distance of 200 miles out to sea.

The United States, of course, was forced to vote against this resolution, which in our opinion not only violates many established principles of international law, but also the long-cherished doctrine of freedom of the seas, which our country has defended for many years.

I am confident that more considered views on this subject will prevail at the Ciudad Trujillo Conference, now that the nations concerned have had time to contemplate the implications of this action.

The United States for its part should enter into the discussions at Ciudad Trujillo with a determination to seek answers to these complicated questions which are legally just and morally sound. To be sure, it probably will not be possible to reach final solutions to the problems on the agenda for this Conference. It should be remembered that this is the first meeting of its kind which has been convoked by the American Republics. But at the very least, the discussions should lead to a better definition of the subjects under consideration, particularly in the complex field of fisheries conservation in this hemisphere. It is to be hoped also that a sound basis will be found for strengthening international cooperation in this field.

As you know, the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House heard Assistant Secretary of State Henry F. Holland discuss both the Mexico City meeting and the forthcoming conference at Ciudad Trujillo at its meeting on February 29. Afterward Chairman Thomas S. Gordon made public a statement urging the State Department to defend vigorously the United States position in regard to freedom of the seas which is so important to the interests of the United States, other nations of our hemisphere and to the rest of the free world.

As a Representative of one of our country's great fishing States, I would like to make a matter of record my strong support for the views expressed by the chairman of the subcommittee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RILEY (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for Monday and Tuesday, March 12 and 13, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for Monday and Tuesday, March 12 and 13, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for Monday and Tuesday, March 12 and 13, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for Monday and Tuesday, March 12 and 13, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for Monday and Tuesday, March 12 and 13, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. RAY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 1 week, on account of death in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2552. An act to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; and

H. R. 7201. An act relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, March 13, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1616. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of \$1,614,562, together with such

amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (H. Doc. No. 355); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1617. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the report of activities of the Veterans' Administration as of June 30, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 536, 71st Congress, and Public Law 346, 78th Congress, also included is the annual report of the Veterans' Educational Appeals Board established by section 2 of Public Law 610, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 248); to the Committee on Veterans Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1618. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 75,000 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 597, 50 U. S. C. 98b (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1619. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1620. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of January 31, 1956, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1621. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with E. H. Flother, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Lake Mead National Recreation Area, will authorize the concessioner to continue to provide accommodations, facilities, and services at the Willow Beach site in Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev., during a 3-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1622. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Martin Kilian, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Mount Rainier National Park, will authorize the concessioner to provide accommodations, facilities, and services within the Ohanape-cosh Hot Springs area of Mount Rainier National Park, Wash., for a 1-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1623. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Sfc. Henry F. Ferry"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1624. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend subdivision (e) of section 58—Notices—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1625. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration

and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1626. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1627. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 6, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on New Creek, Staten Island, N. Y., in the interest of navigation, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1628. A letter from the Adjutant General, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of the 57th National Encampment, United Spanish War Veterans, held in Long Beach, Calif., September 18 to 22, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 356); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1629. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to a letter dated February 16, 1956, enclosing copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, and submitting a copy of a classified order relating to Michael Isaac Mortimer Sanders as an additional case in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee of conference. S. 1287. A bill to make certain increase in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system (Rept. No. 1869). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H.

Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. R. 9860. A bill to provide for examination, licensing, registration, and regulation of professional and practical nurses, and for nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 9861. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to provide that the level of price supports for certain basic agricultural commodities shall be related to the units of production produced on the farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 9862. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees and certain widows of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9863. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to eliminate certain deductions from a spouse's annuity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 9864. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 9865. A bill to provide for the consolidation of the existing Veterans' Administration hospital and regional office at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 9866. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that a discharge in bankruptcy will release a bankrupt from liability from certain debts if the creditor fails to object to such discharge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9867. A bill to provide that certain Federal surplus property may be donated to youth camps and centers not organized for profit; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9868. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide insurance thereunder against the cost of hospitalization for insured aged persons and their dependents and for the survivors of deceased insured persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 9869. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 9870. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 9871. A bill to extend until June 30, 1959, the effective period of the increases made by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1952 in the proportion of certain State public-assistance expenditures to be borne from Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 9872. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases

in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 9873. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building for the United States Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 9874. A bill to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 9875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only with respect to that portion of the amount paid for any admission which is in excess of \$1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 9876. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interest in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries as they affect such States; and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 9877. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 9878. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 9879. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 9880. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 9881. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 9882. A bill to amend and clarify section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to confirm jurisdiction in the Federal courts to enforce section 9 (g) (3); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 9883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9884. A bill to provide that certain voluntary employees' beneficiary associations shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 9885. A bill to authorize a project for the Buchanan Reservoir on the Chowchilla River, San Joaquin Valley, Calif., for flood control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9886. A bill to authorize the project for the Hidden Reservoir on the Fresno River, San Joaquin Valley, Calif., for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 9887. A bill to increase the monthly rates of disability compensation payable to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9888. A bill to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 9889. A bill to provide for averaging taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9890. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9891. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9892. A bill to amend the provisions of the Revised Statutes relating to physical examinations preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9893. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 9894. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution to commemorate the quadricentennial anniversary of the establishment of the first settlement in Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 424. Resolution providing for employment of four additional laborers, office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 9895. For the relief of Willie H. Tension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. Res. 425. Resolution for the relief of the Northern Pacific Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

631. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of members of WCTU and men's Bible class, First Baptist Church, Emporium, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

632. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted by the Jacob Dineson Lodge No. 422, Independent Order of Brith Abraham, urging that Israel be permitted to purchase arms from the United States for the defense of her established borders and that the United States, England, and France enter into a security pact with Israel guaranteeing its present established borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

633. By Mr. HOSMER: Petition of certain residents of the 18th Congressional District of California, who request enactment by Congress of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

634. Also, petition of certain residents of the 18th Congressional District of California, who petition adoption by Congress of the Townsend plan, defined in H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472, as an amendment to the Social Security Act in place of the present programs of old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance, stating (1) this legislation would provide adequate social security for the aged, for the physically handicapped, and for widowed mothers with dependent children; and (2) under this legislation monthly benefits would be of great economic value to the Nation, providing additional consumer buying power, stabilizing production on the farms and in the factories, thus maintaining employment at steady high levels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

635. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Mrs. Maude Morlan and 14 other citizens of Marion County, Oreg., urging that the Townsend plan, as defined in H. R. 4471, be enacted

into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

636. Also, petition of Willis E. Brown and 7 other citizens of Washington County, urging that the Townsend plan, as defined in H. R. 4471, be enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

637. Also petition of Mrs. S. L. Mullan and 7 other citizens of Washington County, Oreg., urging that the Townsend plan, as defined in H. R. 4471, be enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

638. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Thornton and 1,038 other residents of Erie, York, Red Lion, Dover, and Mifflinburg, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

639. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the trustee, Palo Verde Union School District, Tule and Kaweah River area, in the county of Tulare, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the immediate appropriation of the initial funds necessary for the commencement and construction of Success and Terminus Dams, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

640. Also, petition of the executive vice chairman, Committee to Save the Middle East from Communism, New York, N. Y.,

petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to perpetuating the high principles and ideals of our country, and in preserving world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

641. Also, petition of the secretary, American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to approving the principle set forth in Senate bill 748, 84th Congress, etc; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

642. Also, petition of the grand knight, Sag Harbor Council, No. 584, Knights of Columbus, Sag Harbor, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

643. Also, petition of the chief clerk, Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging passage of H. R. 8836 or other similar legislation now pending before the Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

644. Also, petition of the president, the Porterville Junior Chamber of Commerce, Porterville, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting and urging the early completion of the Success and Terminus Dams in Tulare County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. John J. Sparkman, of Alabama, at Meeting of the Amen Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on March 3, 1956, in Pittsburgh, Pa., at a meeting of the Amen Corner, four Senators addressed that historical association, my colleague the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], my colleague the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], my colleague the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself.

The only one of the four who had prepared an address was the Senator from Alabama. Since he delivered a very interesting address on the present situation as it relates to Communist Russia, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN AT A MEETING OF THE AMEN CORNER, HOTEL WILLIAM PENN, PITTSBURGH, PA., MARCH 3, 1956

I am profoundly honored to have been invited to address this distinguished gathering of the membership of the Amen Corner.

It is my understanding that the stated purpose of this meeting is to enable "men of many minds, without regard to race, creed, politics, or previous condition, to gather nocturnally, quite haphazardly, at some place of convenient rendezvous, to discuss as the spirit moves them, any subject under

the rising or the setting sun, and, without let or hindrance, apply to the arts forensic any system of logic or reason which the individual, in his sovereign right, might elect."

I assume that these prerogatives apply equally in the case of guest speakers. Accordingly, I shall speak tonight—since the spirit has moved me—on new problems which the American Nation faces in the present-day world. I shall endeavor to apply to this subject arts forensic and some semblance of logic or reason.

Our basic policy is to do what we can to keep peace in the world. As a corollary, our policy must be designed to prevent the Soviet nation and its Communist satellites from attaining their aim of world domination by war or means other than war. And we must, in addition, strengthen the free nations of the world and expand our alliances and security arrangements with them so as to prevent their defeat from external aggression or from efforts of Communist forces inside their borders.

It has become apparent recently that the Soviet line is changing. The cold war is still on, but the emphasis has been altered. I hope that I am wrong when I say that I fear the present initiative in this redirection is with the Communists. I should like to be able to agree with Secretary Dulles that the Soviet shift indicates a failure of Stalinist-Leninist policy; that the Soviets have abandoned a program of intolerance and violence. My feeling—to paraphrase Homer—is: Beware the Soviets bearing gifts.

Tonight I propose to discuss new developments within the stated framework of our world aims—that is, preservation of peace, prevention of Soviet aggrandizement by war or means short of war, and strengthening of the free nations. I shall confine my remarks to four developments, and the problems which they create:

1. Redirection of our competition with the Soviets in the area of economic and scientific aid to underdeveloped countries;

2. Altered posture in the field of nuclear defense;

3. Similar changes in the field of guided missiles; and

4. Intensified need for more and better trained and educated personnel, particularly in the field of science.

Obviously, I have not attempted to cover all major facets of our foreign and military policies. I will not consider questions of military aid and defensive alliances. Their omission does not, however, imply that they are not vastly important. But we must realize that military alliances alone will not successfully counteract the new Soviet economic and political offensive which is in full swing in the Middle East and Asia.

I have chosen, instead, these topics because they involve areas of immense challenge in this mid-20th century. Moreover, these are the areas in which we are entering the most intense competition with the Soviets.

Communists are on the move throughout the underdeveloped countries of the world with aid, trade, arms, good will missions, technical missions, student exchanges, and neutrality propaganda.

The Communist economic offensive is under way in the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and South America. Moreover, offers of aid usually accompany trade proposals. These we know have been made to India, Burma, Indonesia, Iran, and Afghanistan.

In the Middle East, Russian trade overtures have been tendered to Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and in recent days, Lebanon. There, a team of Russian experts has arrived with offers to the Lebanese Government of assistance in the development of the country. The immediate Soviet offer is reported to concern highways and communications, but general cooperation in broad areas of technical and agricultural activities are thought to be involved also.

Closer to home, the Russians have made generous offers of trade and economic assistance to Latin America through the medium of a statement by Premier Bulganin to the Latin American publication *Vision*.

Russia has sponsored a million-ton steel plant for India, and a \$20-million road and development program in Africa. We know that the Russians offered to build the Aswan Dam project for Egypt.